

May 1, 1973

the present time, extended facilities are permitted within a limit of 2600 feet of the parent bank. Under this amendment which was suggested to me and given to me by Senator Schmit, this simply provides that banks that do not now have, some banks have built these facilities, but banks that do not have these facilities may build or construct their first facility beyond the 2600 foot limit. However, if they construct two facilities and this bill limits it to two facilities, the second facility must be constructed within the 2600 foot limit.

SPEAKER: Any discussion of that amendment? Are you ready for the question? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: May I ask Senator Carsten a question for clarification. Now if a bank does not have a detached facility, the first one that it builds can be beyond the limit...

SENATOR CARSTENS: Of 2600 feet.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the second one must be within the limit. Now if a bank already has one...

SENATOR CARSTENS: Within the 2600 foot limit...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then it cannot build one beyond that?

SENATOR CARSTENS: Yes, yes, it can build the second one within the corporate limits beyond the 2600 foot limit.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Very tricky.

SPEAKER: Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question? Question is, shall the Carstens amendment be adopted? All those in favor say aye, those opposed no. Amendment stands adopted.

CLERK: There are no further amendments, Mr. President.

SPEAKER: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I move the bill be advanced to E & R. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this bill that Senator Carstens has explained with his amendment merely provides for one additional teller facility within the corporate limits of the city. Twelve years ago this Legislature passed the original auxiliary teller facility bill which provided for drive-in facilities with limited service capacity for banks. Because of the advent of the automobile and the increasing dependence on the automobile, it became very popular, became a very important part of banking. Because of this, there has been interest in many areas that we should expand this facility in order that we provide better service to the customers of the banks. There have been conversations about the bill that are not true and very frankly at this time I'm going to go into some of the comments that have been made. There have been allegations that this is a branch banking bill. This is not a branch banking bill. This bill is an auxiliary teller facility bill. The bill has been debated vigorously and thoroughly and repeatedly by bankers but I would suggest that if you will check your mail you will find that very few bank customers, if any, have opposed this bill. You will find that supermarkets, drug stores, hardware stores, implement shops, every other type of business facility have followed their customers, have expanded their service to customers. It seems inconsistent in this day and age that we would deny to banks that right to expand their service. I would hope that this bill would be advanced and that it would go on to Final Reading and be enacted into law. If there are any questions, I'll be very happy to try to answer them.

SPEAKER: Senator Murphy.